

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 6.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1809. [Price 10d.

In the old Pitt administration, about the year 1800, the sum of *fifty-four thousand pounds* were lent, out of the public money, without any previous consent of Parliament, to the DUKE OF YORK, which was to be repaid by instalments of one thousand pound each quarter of a year, *but not to begin until January 1805.* The Duke was then, as he is now, Commander in Chief, Colonel of Guards, &c. &c. and had pensions, for himself and Duchess, to the amount of *thirty thousand pounds a year*, not including any grant upon the Irish establishment.

The earl of Hardwicke (*brother of Mr. CHARLES YORKE,*) obtained, in September 1805, the reversion of the sinecure place of *Clerk of the Common Pleas in the Irish Exchequer.* This place, which is, in the Parliamentary Reports, stated to be worth *eleven thousand and ninety-four pounds a year*, is now enjoyed by the earl of Buckinghamshire; and, observe, it is, after his death, to be enjoyed by lord Hardwicke during the lives of his two sons, lord viscount Royston and Charles James Yorke.

BERESFORD, jun. and James Beresford, esqrs. have for their joint lives, with benefit of survivorship, a *thousand pounds a year*, as WINE-TASTERS in Ireland, which place they have enjoyed since 18th February, 1802. H. B. Beresford, and John Claudius Beresford, jun. have the lucrative place of STOREKEEPERS OF THE CUSTOM-HOUSE, Dublin, and have had it since May, 1802. The amount of the profits is not stated in the Report.

[193]

DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 192.)

I last week expressed my regret, that any thing should have occurred to prevent me from giving an account of the campaign in Spain. That expression I now repeat; and, there are several other subjects, of great political importance, on which I am anxious to offer some remarks to the public; but, the subject of the Charges against the Duke of York, especially as these charges have been forced into connection with questions of general policy and liberty; this subject is not only of more interest than any other, but, it absolutely supersedes all other; discussion upon any other subject, is, in fact, useless, till this has been decided upon. An attempt has, through a connection with Mr. Wardle's charges, been made to deprive us of the remains of our freedom. From the tone and manner of the venal herd of writers, it has long been manifest, that there was on foot a scheme for putting down all free discussion; and, upon the preferring of these charges, they have broke out afresh, and with more boldness than ever, in accusations, not only against the freedom of the press, but also against the freedom of the tongue. Their mode of reasoning is this: "these charges are false; such charges are the consequence of the licentiousness of writing and of speaking; such charges tend to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution; to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution would be to produce general confusion, distress, misery, and blood-shed; there-

[194]

fore, it is the interest of the nation in general, and particularly of all persons of property, to concur in putting a stop to this licentiousness of writing and of speaking." Such is the reasoning of the venal writers, in news-papers, magazines, pamphlets, and especially in the poor party Reviews, which are conducted by clergymen, by salaried magistrates, and by pensioners. To this sort of reasoning not a little countenance has now been given by persons in possession of great official power. One minister has said, that it is become matter of doubt with many good men, whether the benefit of a free press be not overbalanced by the licentiousness attending it; and another of the king's ministers has said, that it is not perceived by every one, how difficult it is, in many cases, to convict a man of a libel, though the libel be obvious enough. Just at this very time, too, we see advertised, at an enormous expence, to be published by the Horse-Guards bookseller, EGERTON, a pamphlet pointing out the present difficulties of producing conviction in cases of libel, which pamphlet is dedicated to the Duke of York and Albany. While this is going on, a Mr. WHARTON, who, I am told, is the same that is Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, is publishing a pamphlet to inculcate the notion, that Jacobinism is revived. This is, to be sure, an excessively stupid and dirty performance; it is so very low, so very shabby, so very despicable, that one cannot help laughing at it, especially when one considers it as opposed to the Edinburgh Review; but, it does, nevertheless, tend to prove the existence of a

concert, premeditated or accidental, to persuade the public at large, *that there is yet too much freedom of writing and speaking enjoyed.*—Till this point, therefore, is settled, all other public matters are uninteresting. From freedom of speech and of the press, the next step is the safety of property and person. The war in Spain, or any where else; the success or failure of any military or naval enterprize; the additional conquests and increasing means of the Emperor Napoleon; all these are of no interest to us, if we be in a state of uncertainty as to what is to be the fate of our freedom at home. We are called upon daily for "sacrifices" in support of the war against the Emperor of France; and, upon *what ground* are these sacrifices demanded? Why, upon the ground, that the war is necessary to prevent our country from being finally conquered by Napoleon. And, why, wherefore, *for what reason*, are we called upon to make sacrifices to prevent our country from being conquered by Napoleon? The reason alledged is this: that, if he were to conquer our country, we should become slaves; that is to say, we, like the people in France, should be deprived of the liberty of uttering our complaints, whatever corrupt and profligate acts our rulers might be guilty of; and, that, we, being thus deprived, should, in a short time, have no security for our property or our lives. It is to prevent this evil; this very evil, that we are making daily such enormous pecuniary sacrifices, and that so many of our countrymen make a sacrifice of their lives. Viewing the struggle in any other light, there is no sense in it. In any light but this we cannot view the contest, without acknowledging ourselves to be almost upon a level with the brute creation. It is not for a name, for an empty sound, for any thing merely imaginary, that we are making all these unparalleled sacrifices. It is not for any thing theoretical; but for the substantial practical benefit of English freedom; the right, the legal right, of freely making our complaints, and of demanding redress, when we think ourselves injured or insulted; which, as all the world must see, are the only means of insuring safety to property and persons.—Till, therefore, we see the result of the pending proceedings, and the fate of the doctrines, now abroad, relative to the freedom of the people, all other public matters, not excepting those relating to our means of defence against the conquering Napoleon, are, comparatively at least, of very trifling

importance. To busy ourselves about schemes of war or peace, or of political economy; thus to busy ourselves, while the present proceedings are unclosed and while these new doctrines are undecided upon, would be as foolish as for a man to be engaged in making repairs at one end of his house, while the other end was on fire.—This being my view of the matter, I shall, as far as my small power will go, keep the attention of the public closely nailed to the inquiries now going on, relative to the conduct of the Duke of York, who is not to be regarded merely as "a son of the crown," as Mr. Fuller called him, nor merely as the person, to whose skill and courage the military defence of our country is committed; but also as a person who has the chief command of a department, which costs this nation 23 millions of pounds sterling a year; and who, under the king's sole controul, has the absolute power of promoting, or of cashiering, any one, or any number, of about twelve, or fifteen, thousand commissioned and staff officers, connected by ties, more or less close, with almost all the families, of any note, in the kingdom. Merely as a son of the king, and a person receiving such large sums out of the public purse, we should have an interest, and a deep interest, too, in the moral example of the Duke of York; what, then, must be our interest in his wisdom and integrity, when we see committed to his hands a far greater degree of power than has, in this country, ever before been committed to the hands of any individual?—In my last, at page 174, I was obliged to break off the insertion of the first Debate upon this all-important subject. The remainder of that debate I shall now first insert, and, when that is done, I shall come to the first Examination of witnesses, of which Examination I shall be careful to omit no essential part, and especially of what has a tendency in favour of the Duke of York; because, on every account, my wish is, that no conclusion against him should be drawn from doubtful premises.

Debate of the 27th January, continued from page 174.

—and of this plan the present was only a particular instance, (*hear! hear!*).—†

† He was glad that this enquiry was to take place, because there was in the country a conspiracy against all that was eminent in the state. They all knew what that spirit was upon which this conspiracy was

Let blame fall where it ought; but the House ought to consider the illustrious object against whom the charge was directed; they ought to consider his high station in the country, and the *eminent services* which he had performed for the country, in the state to which he had brought the army—(hear! What was the state of the army when he became Commander in Chief? It *scarcely deserved the name of an army*, and it was now found by experience to be, in proportion to its numbers, the best army that ever existed. The best mode to do justice to the sovereign—to do justice to the high character now impeached—and to do justice to the country, would, perhaps, be to appoint a Parliamentary Commission, with power to examine each party on oath—(loud cries of hear! hear! from both sides of the House.) The gentleman might have circumstances in view to support these charges, which he believed to be founded in truth. He only spoke of this Commission with reference to his own argument. He had said that he believed a CONSPIRACY to exist, and if the House could go along with him, and suppose that this was actually the case, he threw out for their consideration, whether a Parliamentary Commission with power to examine on oath was not preferable to a Committee. He could not think he had done his duty if he had not thrown out this idea for consideration. The importance of the subject well deserved such a mode of proceeding. But at all events, he was *happy* that the matter would now be properly investigated.

Sir FRANCIS BURDETT considered the founded; and though it was not the same at present as at the time of the French revolution, yet, as the *late Mr. Pitt* had truly said "*the jacobinical spirit, when once roused, is not easily put down.*" The spirit was not yet extinct, and the consequence was a conspiracy for *talking and writing* down every thing illustrious and eminent in the nation—to run down the royal family through the duke of York, and to run down the army through its generals. This was a consequence of a free press, the freedom of which was justly considered the *palladium of liberty*, but whose licentiousness was the destruction of civil society. That licentiousness of the press had been actively directed against the illustrious person who was the object of this motion, and who from his station and *all his past services*, might be supposed secure from its attacks.

subject most important, and demanding the deepest and most accurate inquiry. He coincided with the right hon. gent. opposite (Mr. Yorke), that the House should maturely deliberate on the mode of proceeding best calculated to render effectual justice.

Mr. ADAM stated, that for nearly the period of 20 years he had been, from professional avocations, very intimately connected not alone with the pecuniary concerns of the illustrious personage affected by the motion of the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), but even with his embarrassments. In the attention which he had directed to those concerns, he was assisted by the most frank and candid communications from his royal highness. Every difficulty, and every particular was disclosed to him by his royal highness with a recollection the most retentive, an accuracy the most correct, and a fidelity the most unquestionable. If, therefore, any such irregularities or transactions took place, as the motion of that night went to convey, *it was almost impossible but that in the course of his inquiries some feature of such a system would have appeared*, whereas the direct contrary was the result of a long and minute application to the pecuniary transactions of his royal highness*. Having felt it his duty to make this statement, he had next to impress upon the House that both in justice to its own privileges, and to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, it ought not to surrender its inquisitorial powers,

* At every moment of that long period he had possessed the unlimited confidence of that illustrious person, even during his embarrassments (for as they had been under the consideration of Parliament, he may advert to these embarrassments), and in all his experience of him, he had known his royal highness uniformly to state the situation of his affairs with an accuracy that was extraordinary, with a truth beyond example, and with a fidelity of memory that reflected the highest credit upon his understanding. In all that time he had never heard of his having procured any accommodation or loan on any other terms, than the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Devonshire, or the Duke of Northumberland would, if they had occasion. This he stated, in order to shew that, in the inquiry that was to take place, from what he knew personally, he could confidently assert that the facts alledged would prove unfounded.

nor delegate to any Select or Secret Committee that inquiry, which, to be efficient, ought to be public, and for the *publicity* of which there was no person in the country *more anxious* than his royal highness the duke of York—(*Hear! hear!*).

Mr. WILBERFORCE expressed his sense of the importance of the subject which was submitted to the consideration of the House. He was confident that the hon. mover was impressed with the great responsibility which attached to a charge brought, as it was, against such an elevated character in the country. He did by no means wish to convey that the extent of such responsibility ought at all to deter a member of that House from bringing before it an accusation, for which he had convincing testimony, although directed against one of the most considerable persons in the empire, both in rank or influence; but he did conceive that when high character was implicated, the most efficient and most satisfactory mode of investigation ought to be adopted. To enable the House to arrive at that desirable end, he fully agreed with his right Hon. friend (Mr. Yorke) near him, that the investigation of the charges that night preferred ought to be committed to a Parliamentary Commission, specially delegated for that specific purpose. Such inquiry was not to be considered private or secret. It would afford the best species of communication, namely, publicity at the end, but not in the progress. Whoever had attended to the consequences of public examination at the Bar of the House, could not be blind to the numerous and fatal inconveniencies of such a mode of proceeding. The very object for which it was proposed was too often defeated by the means. By acquiescing to the appointment of a commission the witnesses would be examined upon oath, all party bias and personal altercation would be prevented, and, of course a weight and confidence would be attached to the decision of those delegated, which it was impossible to expect from any public discussion or examination at the Bar. It was for the house to bear strongly in its recollection, that in the present unexampled and critical state of the civilized world, all Europe looked with a vigilant and anxious attention to the deliberations of the British House of Commons. *That House was now put on its trial before the scrutinizing tribunal of public opinion.* It had to render justice, both to the illustrious personage, whose character he expected

would come clear and unsullied from the ordeal, and to the country, who was equally interested in the result. The claims of the public demanded that the representatives of the people should look to substantial justice, however high the rank, eminent the services, or splendid the connections of the dignified personage against whom such charges were preferred.—That justice, he conceived, could be most satisfactorily obtained by an inquiry, private in its progress, but to be public in the result, particularly when he reflected on the description of persons likely to be examined, and the importance of the interests affected by the accusation.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER coincided in the unanimous feelings of the House, that to the most solemn and serious accusation brought forward that night, the most solemn and serious inquiry ought to be afforded. The only difference that seemed to exist in the mind of gentlemen was, as to the manner of conducting that investigation, whether the ends, to which all looked with equal eagerness, were more likely to be acquired by a private and delegated examination, or by a full, prompt, and public discussion, arising from the testimony, which the hon. gent. who submitted those charges to parliamentary considerations may be enabled to produce at the Bar of that House. When he contemplated the important interests which the country had, whether in acquitting the exalted personage, if, as he was convinced, the event would prove, such charges could not be substantiated, or in rendering justice to the dignity of the character of parliament, he was compelled by all and every consideration, to call upon that House not to abandon its legitimate judicial province, and by its first step to deprive itself of that freedom of conduct and action, that might eventually preclude it from adopting the course which it might be convinced was ultimately serviceable. There was no course that could prove satisfactory to the country, but a public one—and whatever inconveniencies may follow from its adoption, they were dissipated by the superior and paramount advantages. Independent of its general recommendation some consideration ought to be extended to the wishes of his royal highness. That wish he could positively state was, that the investigation should be most complete and public (*hear! hear! hear!*). There was nothing that his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close

discussion of those charges. Standing as that illustrious personage did on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence which he was enabled to produce in refutation of these charges, he was most peculiarly anxious to appear before the country; if acquitted, acquitted by the most accurate and severe inquiry, or if condemned, condemned by the most public and undeniable evidence. Was the present moment suitable for the statements, he believed he could enter into particulars which would convince the House, that it was impossible to bring those alledged charges home to his royal highness. The hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had in the course of his speech stated a circumstance which particularly involved the character of his majesty's government. He had mentioned that two members of the king's cabinet were concerned in this agency for the disposal of government patronage. This was a topic on which he felt it due to himself to require the fullest information, and it was for the option of the hon. gent. to determine, whether he would afford it in a public manner in that House, or by a private communication to some of the responsible servants of the crown (*a cry of name! name!*). When in possession of that information, he assured the House that by him no measure would be left undone to unravel and elucidate the truth or falsehood of that allegation. It was not for him to tell that House, that in this great capital it might happen that foolish persons were frequently deceived by advertisements in the public papers, announcing the disposal of official patronage. And perhaps it has occasionally turned out, that the very persons who were originally deceived by these advertisements to make applications, did ultimately obtain the very appointments for which they had endeavoured to negotiate; but he was convinced that as there was nothing so discreditable to government, so there was nothing more false in fact than the idea, that money was paid to persons high in office for such transactions. For the distinct manner in which the hon. gent. submitted the question to the House, he conceived him entitled to its thanks. He had pledged himself to bring his charges home to h. r. h. the Duke of York. Upon that pledge the proposed inquiry was admitted; and both for the accuser and the accused, to guard against suppression and insufficiency of evidence, publicity was essentially necessary.

Mr. WARDLE stated, that he was anxi-

ous to afford the fullest inquiry in his power to the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The office where this agency was transacted was in Threadneedle-street, under the firm of Pollman and Heylock. The persons conducting the business there did not deny the influence under which they were able to procure appointments. They had stated various situations purchased in the island of Jamaica, and that two members of the present Cabinet, for whom they acted in such negotiations, and to whom he alluded in his speech, were the lord Chancellor and the duke of Portland.

It was then carried, *nemine contradicente*, That the Conduct of his royal highness the Commander in Chief, in the appointment of Commissions, and filling up of Vacancies in the Army, be referred to a Committee.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER then moved, that it should be a Committee of the whole House.

LORD FOLKSTONE considered the honourable mover entitled to the fullest credit, for the manner in which he brought the subject forward. He was of opinion that the ends of justice would be best answered by referring the inquiry to a Select Committee, from whose Reports all the benefits of publicity would be derived. It was extraordinary to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer interfere with the mode of proceeding which the hon. mover had adopted, when the House recollected with what severe comment that gentleman (Mr. Perceval) remarked upon certain members at his side of the House, for the alledged indecorum of taking certain measures out of the hands of the original proposers.

Mr. SECRETARY CANNING conceived that the surprise expressed by the noble lord in seeing his right honourable friend propose to the consideration of that House the most desirable mode of proceeding, would have been prevented if that noble lord had considered the nature of the improvement which was recommended. The interference of his right hon. friend was not to restrict, but to extend inquiry—it was not to narrow the means, but to enlarge the sphere of deliberation. It was an improvement suited to the importance of the accusation, and to that serious discussion which so many commanding inducements pressed it upon that House to afford. The House should recollect that if such charges were proved, the issue of its deliberation might lead to a proceed-

ing affecting the most valuable privileges of Parliament, and the dearest interests of the elevated and illustrious personage affected by their decision. It was established by various precedents in Parliamentary history. It was to a Committee of the whole House the case of the duke of Marlborough was submitted, because such proceeding was considered correspondent with the gravity of its judicial character, and because it was a species of trial which *united earliness with publicity*. When, therefore, the noble lord complained that an attempt was made to take the subject out of the hands of the hon. gent. who originally brought it forward, the propriety of his reproach amounted to this, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had proposed a motion calculated most effectually to promote the object, which the original mover professed to have solely in his view. Indeed the hon. mover himself did not feel any unjustifiable attempt at interference, nor did he evince any hostility to submit his charges to the House of Commons in its most extended capacity. That hon. gent. had declared to the House, that in calling its attention to this very solemn subject, he was solely actuated by the sense of public duty; that he was free from any hostile feeling to the elevated personage, whose character his charges went so vitally to affect. For the impulse of public spirit and disinterested patriotism, he (Mr. Canning) was willing to give him credit, and surely that hon. gent. could not be dissatisfied with those who placed him upon the most commanding stage, to reap the benefit of his patriotic labours.—(*Hear! hear!*).—

(*To be concluded in my next.*)

On Wednesday, the 1st instant, Mr. Wardle, after an introductory speech, brought forward the charge, relating to an exchange of MAJOR BROOKE of the 56th foot to the 5th dragoons, the other party being LIEUT. COL. KNIGHT.—The charge was this: that the application of these two gentlemen had been, for some time, before the Duke of York; that the exchange was not ordered to be permitted, till Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Lieut. Col. Knight, had, through the negotiation of a Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), got the thing effected by paying to Mrs. Clarke the sum of 200*l.*; that the Duke of York, before the exchange was ordered, knew that Mrs. Clarke was to receive some money in consequence of it;

and that, after the exchange was ordered and the money received by Mrs. Clarke, he, the Duke, was informed by her of such receipt.

The first witness, in support of this Charge, was *Dr. Andrew Thynne*, who stated, that, at the request of Mr. Knight, he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke; that he was authorized to offer her 200*l.* if she would cause the exchange to be expedited; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person; that this great person was the Commander in Chief; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness the Gazette, in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, 200*l.* would be very convenient to her; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper; that Mrs. Clarke talked about the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the 200*l.*; that his brother had before received, from the office of the Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that, when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked: "Why was the application made to Mrs. Clarke," he answered, "There was a delay in the business; but the cause of it I do not know. I mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then attending my family. He advised me to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.—Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to keep the whole transaction a secret, lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York; and

that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about 2,000*l.* she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

Mrs. Clarke was next examined by Mr. WARDLE, and her examination, all through, I shall give just as I find it in the Morning Chronicle news-paper, where I find it given in the best manner. The whole of the Evidence, as reported to the House, will hereafter be published in the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES; but, if, upon seeing it in that shape, which I soon shall, I should discover any material error in the news-paper report, I shall lose no time in publishing a correction of it. The evidence of this witness should *all* be before the public; we should have a fair view of every part of it; because she must necessarily be the principal witness *as to the knowledge which the Duke had of these transactions with her*; and because, of course, much, in our decision, must depend upon the *credibility* of her testimony, and that *credibility* must again depend upon the *general complexion and character* of that testimony.

EXAMINATION of *Mrs. Clarke.*

DID the witness in the month of July 1805, reside in Gloucester-place? I did.—Under whose protection was she at that time living? Under that of his royal highness the duke of York.—Did Dr. Thynne at that time attend the witness in his professional capacity? He did, and was for some years in the habit of doing so.—Was there any application made by Dr. Thynne to the witness, relative to an exchange between lieut.-col. Knight and lieut.-col. Brooke? There was, and doctor Thynne urged strongly the necessity of great dispatch.—Was there any pecuniary compliment held out as an inducement to the witness to use her interest to promote the exchange? He promised on the part of Mr. Knight, that a compliment should be made me.—Was not the witness promised a consideration in money when the change would be effected; was she not promised a sum of 200*l.*? I was.—After Dr. Thynne's application to the witness, did she speak to the Commander in Chief upon the subject of that application? I told him of it that day at dinner, and handed over to him the slip of paper Dr. Thynne had given to me, containing the names of the parties. I told him I did not know them, but had reason to believe they would make me a compliment. I did not then state to his royal highness the amount of the sum; but, when the exchange was ef-

fected, and that appeared in the Gazette, I sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne.—Did the witness, after she had sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, receive any pecuniary consideration, from any person, on account of the exchange having been effected? I received afterwards 200*l.* in two Bank notes, under cover, with Dr. Thynne's compliments.—Were the compliments sent verbally by the messenger, or written in the cover? I rather think written, but am not certain.—Did the witness make known to the Commander in Chief the having received this money upon this account? I mentioned it to his royal highness on that day.—Is the witness sure his royal highness must have been apprized of the amount of the notes? He must have been; because I shewed him the note, and sent one of the servants to get it changed for me.—(*Sir T. Turton.*) Does the witness know Mr. Robert Knight? Yes; I met him in company with Mr. Biddulph.—Can the witness state, as near as possible, what conversation passed at this meeting? I cannot recollect. I had certainly a conversation with Mr. R. Knight relative to his brother's exchange. That affair gave rise to our intimacy.—Did the witness ever desire Mr. Robert Knight to keep the transaction about which they were then conferring, a secret? I don't recollect that I did; but it is likely that in such a case I might have given such a caution; perhaps I did; but I don't recollect it.—Did the witness charge Mr. R. Knight to keep that transaction a secret from the Commander in Chief? Oh! no, no, never; certainly not; I'm quite sure of that.—(*Mr. Lyttleton.*) At the time the witness communicated to the duke of York, the application made to her by Dr. Thynne on the part of lieut.-col. Knight to expedite his exchange, did his royal highness make any remark, and what? His royal highness said, he knew the business very well; that there had been much application about it; but that he suspected that *one of them* was rather a *bad subject*. However, he would do it; it should be done.—When the witness shewed to the Commander in Chief the bank note she had received for her using her interest in this business, did his royal highness make any observation, and what? I don't recollect that he made any.—(*The Attorney-General.*) What time was the application of Dr. Thynne made to the witness? I can't say.—Was it more than three days before the exchange appeared in the Gazette? I don't think it was more.—When did the witness first mention this business to col. Wardle? I don't know; it must have been very lately.—Why does the witness say that it must have been very lately? Because I speak from the fact.—Let the witness mention what fact? It was within the last month.—What, within the last month, did the witness communicate to Mr. Wardle? He asked me was it true? I told him it was; it was he attacked me upon the subject; for he had heard it from other quarters, and had asked me only if it was true.—What led the witness to a knowledge of col. Wardle? Himself.—Was it within the last month that the witness

came to know col. Wardle? I knew him six months before he attacked me on this subject.—Did the witness mention it first to col. Wardle, or in consequence of being first questioned by him? In consequence of his first questioning me: he had heard it from other quarters; upon his asking me was it true, I said it was. I did not then think I should have been brought here in consequence of having said so, or I would have concealed it.—Would the witness have willingly concealed it? I concealed it from the beginning: it was not my wish to make it public. I have sense enough to keep private that which ought to be kept private. When the witness gave col. Wardle an account of this transaction, did she give the same account she has now given? No, I did not.—Which was the true account? Both.—In what do both the true accounts differ? I don't think they differ at all. I mean, I did not then go into the detail I have now; my account to Mr. Wardle was a much shorter one than I have given here.—Can the witness name the day either of the week or month on which Dr. Thynne applied to her? Neither.—The witness has said, that it was not more than 3 days before the Gazette; now the Gazette days were either Tuesdays or Saturdays; was it upon either of those days? I can't be particular in so trifling a matter. I am not conversant in days or dates.—Has the witness told the House all she told col. Wardle in her account to him of this transaction? Much more than I told Mr. Wardle.—What has the witness told the House she did not tell col. Wardle? I did not, as I have said already, go so much into detail as I have done now. I did not tell Mr. Wardle about the shewing the bank-note to his royal highness, nor the getting it changed, and other matters of detail which I have mentioned now.—If col. Wardle had not questioned the witness upon this subject, would she have made any communication to him upon it? Perhaps I might, and perhaps I might not.—Had the witness no end to accomplish in making this transaction known? None whatever.—Did the witness never state any grounds of complaint against the duke of York? All my friends knew that I complained of the conduct of his royal highness.—The witness was not asked as to the knowledge of her friends. Did she herself complain of the duke of York, and threaten in certain circumstances to expose him? I never did. All I did was, I sent a letter to Mr. William Adam (he is present) and I said in that letter that if his royal highness did not pay me the annuity, which he, and Mr. Adam for him, promised should be paid punctually, I would publish his royal highness's letters.—Was this the only letter in which the witness made use of those threats? Not threats; I solicited. I wrote two letters. Mr. Adam has them both.—Did the witness never state that she would expose the duke of York if he did not agree to her terms? Never; the worst I did or said against his royal highness was in those letters, and I wrote them in anger. I did not then expect

to be here, nor is it willing in me that I am here. I know of nothing more in the letters; but satisfy yourself; ask for the letters; read them; they can be produced, I suppose, as Mr. Adam is present. He has them.—Did the witness never state to any person whatever, that if the Duke of York did not satisfy her, she would expose him? Never.—Or to that effect? I never said any thing to that effect.—She was quite sure of that? Positive.—Did not she tell Mr. R. Knight something to a similar effect? No, I told him that I was a going to publish the Duke's letters, in order to raise money to pay the creditors, whom his royal highness had refused to pay. *His royal highness had insisted I should plead my marriage to avoid the debts, and if I did not, I must go to prison; there was nothing else for it.* My lawyer sent me this communication.—Who is your lawyer? The gentleman who is now my lawyer was not then.—Who was at that time your lawyer? Mr. Stokes, of Golden-square. He made the communication to me.—And who made it to him? Somebody from Mr. Wm. Adam, who is himself a sort of a lawyer. Did not the witness lately send for Mr. R. Knight to come to her? Since our acquaintance began, I have asked him often to call and see me.—Did not the witness write Mr. R. Knight a note, requesting him to call upon her, and was it not in consequence of that summons that he did call upon her? It was nothing more than a common note, such as I am in the habit of sending to many more gentlemen of my acquaintance.—Is the witness a married woman? You have no reason to doubt it.—Are you a married woman or not? I am married: Mr. William Adam there has my certificate.—When was the witness married, where, and to whom? I was married about 14 or 15 years ago at Pancras, to a Mr. Joseph Clark.—Is your husband now living? I don't know.—Did not the witness swear herself a widow? No, I did not swear it; I'll explain that: I had applied to the duke of York for 1 or 200*l.*; he sent me back for answer, that if I dared to say or write any thing against him, *he would put me in the pillory or the Bastile.* His royal highness was alarmed at my having (as he thought) sworn myself a widow-woman, *as then the debts could not be avoided*; but I had not sworn myself a widow woman; but as I was called upon at the Court Martial I told the Advocate-General (who certainly treated my distressing situation with more delicacy than the gentleman who has been now examining me), that I thought it would be wrong for me, who was so well-known to be living with the duke of York, to call myself a married woman, and I did say to him, after I had left the Court (not while I was in the Court) that I was a widow. I said I was, but I did not swear I was, though it was erroneously entered in the minutes of the Court Martial.—Who brought this message from the duke of York to the witness? One of his royal highness's most particular and intimate friends.—Who is he? One Taylor, a shoemaker in Bond-street, very well known to

Mr. applic to h did s sador mean shoer who high I hav Mrs. not s whic was not r there lieve her l Clar the v Mr. see of n and the neve nect him nor agai don no wri Yes acti my not I d to l I d pla bee in W du tha ans W ing lec be kn sto I d ma da the wa I un vis do th St al — P

Mr. Adam.—How did the witness make her application for this one or two hundred pounds to his royal highness? By my pen.—By whom did she send her letter? By this same ambassador of Morocco.—Whom does the witness mean by the ambassador of Morocco? The shoemaker.—Was it Taylor, the shoemaker, who brought back the answer from his royal highness? Yes. He gave it as the Duke's words. I have mentioned Taylor's own language.—Mrs. Clarke was then asked whether she had not said that she was born at Berkhamstead, to which she answered, that if she had said so, it was in a laughing and jocular way.—Did you not make Mr. Adam believe that you was born there? I don't know whether Mr. Adam believed it, or not.—Did the witness represent her husband as the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? He told me that he was so.—Did the witness believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? Yes.—Did you ever see Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never saw any of my husband's relations, except a brother and sister.—Do you now believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never asked him any thing concerning his connection. He is nothing at all to me, nor I to him. I have not seen him these three years, nor heard of him since he brought the action against the duke.—What is your husband? I don't know.—What is his business? He is in no business; his father was, he was a millwright.—Did you ever live in Tavistock place? Yes.—When? I don't recollect the time exactly. I lived there under the protection of my brother.—How many years ago? I do not recollect.—When did you go to Park-lane? I do not recollect.—How long before you went to Park-lane did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Was you in any other place between the two periods? I might have been in another place.—How long did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Where did you live when you first knew the duke of York? I beg to be excused answering that question.—*Chairman.* The witness must answer the question? I do not recollect.—Why then did you desire to be excused answering the question? Because I did not recollect.—Is that the only reason for the wish to be excused? Yes.—I desire positively to know whether the witness did not live in Tavistock-place before she knew the duke of York? I do not think that is a fair question. I am a married woman with several children, and one daughter grown up.—I wish to know whether the witness lived in Tavistock-place, before she was under the protection of the duke of York? I was then under his protection.—Was she under his protection when she first lived at Tavistock-place? No, under that of my brother.—Has not the witness said, that she was a widow? No, never, except on the occasion of the court-martial which she had mentioned. She then thought it was saving her family, and also the duke of York, as he too was married.—Does she say she never lived in Tavistock-place, till under the protection of the duke of

York? I knew him previous to that, but did not live with him.—Did she not represent herself to the trades-people there as a widow? Never, to any one.—I would ask, whether she has not threatened, that unless the duke would come into her terms, and pay her what money she wanted, she would put his letters into the hands of persons who would pay her? No.—Did she not state, that she either had or would put on paper all the transactions of the last 14 or 15 years, and put the memorial into the hands of persons who would publish it, unless the duke of York would pay her? No, she could not recollect that she ever said so, but she referred to the letter or letters she had written to Mr. Adam.—The witness had said that she had mentioned this business to others besides Mr. Wardle. Who were they? She did not recollect all her acquaintances with whom she might have conversed on the subject, but at any rate it must have been in a slight sort of way, and was of no consequence.—How long was it before she mentioned the business to Mr. Wardle? She did not exactly recollect, but it was since she wrote to Mr. Adam. She did not know Mr. Wardle at that time.—Who was present besides Mr. Wardle when she first mentioned this business? Some ladies, perhaps, of her acquaintance, but nobody of any consequence.—To what man besides Mr. Wardle had she mentioned it? There were many acquaintances of her's to whom it might have been mentioned, but she could not recollect any particular persons.—Did the witness know major Hogan? No, never. She had never seen him in her life. Mr. Greenwood had written to her to say that he was sorry to find she was acquainted with a Mr. Finnerty. She had about nine years ago seen a man of that name, at Margate, who was said to be connected with a newspaper, but had never seen him since.—(*Examined by Mr. Croker.*) Did the witness recollect any particulars of the conversation she had with Mr. R. Knight, lately, on this subject? Yes. He asked on what terms she was with the duke of York? whether she had been paid her annuity? She said, no: that the trades-people were clamorous for their money, and that she would publish the letters to pay them. Upon which he said, that he hoped she would spare his brother.—Whether any other notice had been taken of this business by Mr. Knight, except that she would spare his brother? No; certainly not.—Whether she had made any inquiries of Mr. Knight with regard to the business under discussion? She asked Mr. Knight what sort of a man the other was who had exchanged with his brother; and he said he was an Irishman.—Whether the witness said any thing more to Mr. Wardle on this subject than at the particular time she had before mentioned, and whether she still would abide by that answer? Yes, she did abide by it.—Whether she had any more than one conversation with Mr. Wardle upon this subject? No; and she hoped she would never hear of it any more.—Whether she was in the habit of

seeing Mr. Wardle more frequently than when making inquiries relative to this business? Yes; she had seen him on other occasions.—Could the witness recollect when the conversation on this subject took place? She had answered that question before.—Had any conversation taken place on this subject within these three days? No.—Had any taken place since Friday last? No.—Did the witness see Mr. Wardle on Saturday last? She saw him at the Opera House.—Whether she saw him any where else than at the Opera House, on Saturday last. Whether Mr. Wardle had intimated that he meant to call her as a witness, and when? Soon after she saw the newspaper which gave an account of the business having been brought forward in the house, he called, and she was angry, as he had made very free with the name of a friend of hers, a Mr. Donovan. Mr. Wardle had one morning taken away a parcel of letters of hers without her sanction, and she could never get them back again.—Whether it was not on Saturday that she saw the newspaper which gave the information? She did not recollect.—Whether she did not see Mr. Wardle on Sunday? She was in the habit of seeing him every other day. She could not exactly recollect.—Did she see him yesterday? She did not.—Whether she was certain of that? She believed she might speak positively.—Had she any conversation with him on the subject this day? Yes.—Whether she now still adhered to her former assertion, that she had no conversation with him on this subject since Friday last? This day something had passed between them about appearing to the summons; and about a week ago he had said that the house would commit her if she did not appear, and send her where they had sent some sheriffs before.—(*Examined by Mr. Lyttleton.*) The witness had stated that she had shewn the note to the Commander in Chief; he wished to know whether she had shewn it at any time except when she mentioned the business of exchange? No.—By whom had the message about Finnerty been sent? By Taylor. He told her that Mr. Greenwood had been reading Mr. Hogan's pamphlet and others; and that he had been informed that she was intimate with Mr. Finnerty, which she then denied, as she did now.—(*Examined by Sir A. Pigot.*) The witness had stated, that Mr. Knight and Mr. Biddulph had paid her a visit together. Did Mr. R. Knight soon after call upon her alone? Many times.—Did she at any time say to him that she was desirous the business should be concealed from the Duke of York? Never in her life.—If any one had said so, then, it was false? Certainly; and she hoped before she left that place that whoever had said so should be called in.—(*Examined by Lord Folkestone.*) The witness had said that she sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne. He wished to know whether she recollected what was in that note; what were the contents? She did not recollect exactly; but she believed it contained very little.—She had said that the 200*l.* had been sent her in a

note with Dr. Thynne's compliments. Was she quite certain of that? Yes, she was; as she recollected at the time having sent her maid to give the man a guinea.—Were the compliments written in the note, or verbally sent? She was certain that the 200*l.* came inclosed, but as to the compliments, she could not exactly recollect. She had paid very little attention to the matter, as she never expected to be called upon to give an account of the matter.—Did she recollect who brought the note to her house. No; but she understood it to be Dr. Thynne's servant.—Did she recollect the time of the day? It was about the middle of the day.—The witness had said that the exchange took place two days after the application; he wished to know whether she alluded to the application of Dr. Thynne to her, or her application to the duke of York? She spoke to the duke of York about it the same day at dinner.—How soon after that did the exchange appear in the Gazette? Only a few days after.—Whether she had any reason to desire Mr. Knight to conceal his visits from the duke of York, and did she desire him to conceal them? She never received his visits in a way that she wished to be concealed.—(*Examined by Mr. Percival.*) The witness has said that Mr. Wardle had got her letters without her sanction or consent. He wished to know when that happened? She could not tell precisely; but he laughed the matter off, saying, that he would get possession of all her love letters.—Was it before this inquiry was set on foot? Yes.—How long before? She could not recollect.—Had she any conversation on the subject of the letters with Mr. Wardle before he took them. No.—How happened they to be lying in the way? Because she was leaving her house, and removing to her mother's.—Did the witness mean seriously to say that Mr. Wardle took her letters without her authority. Yes; as he had got many other nonsensical little notes which induced him to take these.—Were these the letters of his royal highness the duke of York to the witness. There might be one or two of the letters of his royal highness intermixed with them.—Did the witness mean to say, that these were for the most part, letters of his royal highness? No.—Why then was it said, that these were the letters that led to this inquiry? Because Mr. Wardle had read them.—Did she recollect ever having been offered any money for delivering up the letters of his royal highness. Never.—Did she put them into the hands of any person, in order to forward any negotiation of her own. No; except to Mr. Adam, who was the confidential friend of his royal highness.—Had the witness never said, that she put the letters into the hands of any one; to facilitate a negotiation of her own? No; except to Mr. Adam. She had never written a note on the subject of the letters to any but Mr. Adam.—(*By Lord Stanley.*) Whether the duke of York was in the room when the 200*l.* was brought her? No he was not.—How

soon as
Knight
day.—
the no
the na
had be
was a v
names.

Nov
let us
stands
who h
house
Knigh
tual a
of Yo
tween
excha
the re
not b
that
to M
£. 20
place
chan
place
Clar
havi
Knig
is pr
Mrs.
had
look
com
suffi
vict
bora
pec
in n
vari
that
that
subj
and
rece
it, a
cha
nan
liev
as
stat
dw
got
sire
tha
thi
sho
sta
W
wh
ga

soon after was it that she stated that Mr. Knight had fulfilled his promise? The same day.—Was it on the same day that she desired the note to be changed? Yes.—What was the name of the servant by whom the note had been changed?—She did not know; it was a very irregular thing to ask servants their names.

Now, before we proceed any further, let us take a view of the Evidence as it stands. FIRST, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne, who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained: SECOND, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her £.200, in case the exchange should take place: THIRD, it is *proved*, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place: FOURTH, it is *proved*, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place did receive, from Mr. Knight, the said sum of £.200. All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in *no danger themselves*, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a *bad subject*, but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the £.200, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servant, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, as weighing against her evidence, the statement of Mr. Knight has been much dwelt upon. He, who, after the exchange, got acquainted with her, says, that she desired him to keep the matter *a secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason for this, her fear of the consequences, *if it should reach the Duke of York's ears*. This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who took the bribe, or Mr. Knight, who gave the bribe, and who first tendered the

bribe? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being, in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *internal probabilities* of the case.—Mr. Knight was asked, *what part* of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and, whether it was solely the *money* part of it; he answered, that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke*. This question was put so often, and the reports in all the news-papers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.—Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to *thank* Mrs. Clarke for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her £.200 for that influence; and, was it *probable*, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, *that she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York*? Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that *she took credit to herself for it*; but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's £.200 was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known, that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe, that Mrs. Clarke would say, "It was I who prevailed upon the Duke to permit of your brother's exchange; but, for God's sake, don't let the Duke know of it." Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too preposterous to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*; this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but, to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's *knowing* of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man, with whom *she was taking credit to herself* for having obtained the grant from the Duke, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment enter-

tained by any man in his senses.—It appears, however, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms; and, it is fair to presume, that she did so, because, not only does she admit something of this sort herself, but it appears, that, in two letters to Mr. ADAM, she pushed the threat much further, or, at least, expressed herself more fully. To an enraged woman, fallen from her high estate, and left to be worried by creditors, who had crawled to her in the days of her affluence, a pretty large portion of vindictiveness is fairly imputable: and, this state of her mind the impartial reader of her evidence will not fail to keep constantly in view. Unsupported by *strong* corroborating circumstances I have no hesitation in saying, that her evidence against the Duke of York would not be worth much; and if the fact of the offer of £.200, the subsequent taking place of the exchange, and the actual payment of the £.200, immediately afterwards: if all these facts had not been proved, I should have paid very little attention to her testimony, relating to this transaction.—Still however, the Duke's actually knowing of her pocketing money on account of the exchange rests solely upon her evidence; and, we must now hear what was said by Mr. ADAM, COL. GORDON, and the DUKE'S SERVANT, which, apparently, has been regarded as throwing discredit, not only upon this part of her statement, but upon her general veracity.—We will take the whole of Mr. Adam's statement of the 1st of February as given in the Morning Chronicle of the 2nd.

Mr. Adam said:—A great part of the evidence which I have now to state, I communicated upon a former night to the house. About the year 1789 I was requested by his royal highness the duke of York to look into some of his concerns, and from that period to the present I have continued to examine those concerns with all the attention and accuracy in my power, without acting, as I before mentioned, professionally—without receiving any emolument, but giving my services quite gratuitously. In the year 1805 it came to my knowledge, that the husband of the person who has just gone from your bar, had threatened to bring an action for crim. con. against the duke of York, and, in consequence of this information, it became necessary to inquire into the general conduct of that lady, which was found to be very incorrect. But in my intercourse with his royal highness, I observed, that he was exceedingly unwilling to believe the reports made to him, and he continued so indeed to the last. These reports, however, were of

such a nature as to suggest the propriety of a further investigation, and the result was a confirmation of Mrs. Clarke's incorrectness, which was such as tended much to prejudice the interests of the duke of York, not upon military business, for nothing at all appeared of the description of that now before the Committee; but, with regard to money obtained by an improper use of the duke of York's name; this, I felt it my duty to state fully to his royal highness. For the purpose of having the investigation made, I applied to Mr. Lowton, of the Temple, and he employed Mr. Wilkinson to conduct it, who is generally engaged by that eminent solicitor to make preliminary arrangements upon business committed to his direction. The investigation was completed about the 8th of May, 1805, and I had the details of it laid before the duke of York; the consequence was, that his royal highness came to the resolution of putting an end to his connection with Mrs. Clarke, and he requested me to communicate his resolution to her. The separation was a measure which I so much approved—which I felt to be so material to the interest and credit of the duke, that I was induced to overlook any consideration of unpleasantness, and to accede to his royal highness's request. I saw such a disclosure of her character in the report, that I thought it totally inconsistent with his royal highness's honour any longer to continue the connection.—It appeared, indeed, in this Report, that she pleaded her coverture, in defence to an action for goods which she had obtained by representing herself as a widow. Upon my interview with her, I discovered still further proofs of her incorrectness. Although it turned out that she was married at Pancras, she said that she had been married at Berkhamstead. At Berkhamstead also she stated that she had been born, that her mother's name was Mackenzie, and her father's name Parker. But although I had the register of Berkhamstead examined, for forty years back, no such name was to be found. I took occasion to put many questions to Mrs. Clarke in the course of this interview, and I came away from her with the impression that the facts mentioned in the Report I have alluded to were correct. She had stated that her husband was nephew to Mr. Alderman Clarke, the Chamberlain of London, which statement proved to be unfounded. In announcing to Mrs. Clarke the duke of York's resolution to separate from her altogether, I informed her, by his royal highness's authority, that if her conduct should be correct, she would be allowed 400*l.* a year: but for this there was no bond or written obligation whatever. It was merely an annuity, which his royal highness should be at liberty to withdraw, if the conduct of this lady should not be correct. From the time of that communication I have not seen Mrs. Clarke until she appeared at the bar this night. I have stated, I think, all that relates to the transactions in which my name has been used. Upon recollection there are some other points—I received a letter in June 1808 from Mrs. Clarke, which is, no doubt, that

which she
I believe
aleman w
deed, I e
to Mr. W
it. The
have sta
person, T
an acqu
no know
plained
If I have
be ready
power b
put to
threat c
1805, th
and tha
He did
Mrs C
ions of
the fin
which
concer
certain
royal h
his ann
and he
tion w
raised
of whi
liquida
the pu
him u
charg
ness
much
cessa

C
tary
in s
mak
catic
that
quin
that
the
of l
the
hal
tion
of
on
rec
sor
tha
vic
ch
gi
K
2
or
o

which she has alluded this night. That letter, I believe, still is in the custody of the gentleman who conducted the examination. Indeed, I endorsed the date and transmitted it to Mr. Wilkinson immediately after I received it. The knowledge I have of Mr. Wilkinson I have stated to the Committee; of the other person, Taylor, mentioned by Mrs. Clarke as an acquaintance of the duke of York's, I have no knowledge whatever. I hope I have explained myself satisfactorily to the Committee. If I have not spoken quite intelligibly, I shall be ready to give any further explanation in my power by answering any question that may be put to me. I think it proper to add that the threat of an action for *crim. con.* was made in 1805, that the inquiry immediately followed, and that the separation took place in 1806.—He did not know whether the annuity promised Mrs. Clarke had been paid her or not, as pensions or matters of that sort formed no part of the financial concerns of the duke of York which were under his administration. Those concerns to which he had to attend related to certain claims, for the discharge of which his royal highness had appropriated a proportion of his annual revenue, to manage which Mr. Coutts and he were appointed trustees. This proportion was originally but 12,000*l.* but it was now raised to between 26 and 30,000*l.* a year, out of which £.4000 were annually applied to the liquidation of debt due by his royal highness to the public, on account of the loan advanced to him under Mr. Pitt's administration. To discharge this and other claims, his royal highness had, highly to his honour, set apart as much of his income as, consistently with necessary expenditure, could be possibly spared.

Colonel Gordon, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says, in substance, this: that it is his duty to make to the Duke a report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an enquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the enquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July, 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.

Ludovick Armor, a footman of the Duke of York, said that he was a foreigner;

that he had lived 18 years with the Duke; that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's; that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see; that the Duke was not then there; that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed. In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked (previous to his coming to the House of Commons) the same question about the note, by the Duke, by Mr. Adam, by Mr. Lowten, and by Mr. Wilkinson, and that he had given them the same answer.

I leave the Evidence of Mr. Adam and Col. Gordon, as I find it. The character which Mr. Adam gives of the lady is very bad indeed; but, one cannot help regretting that he should have been the instrument of offering to such a person an annuity of £.400 a year, on the part of the Duke, while the latter was accommodated with so large a loan out of the public money.—If what Ludovick Armor says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs. Clarke says about sending the note to change *must* be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falshood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any reason for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *shewed* the Duke the money would have answered full as well for all the purposes of accusation and of crimination. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falshood, except that of bringing forth Ludovick Armor; or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as awkward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.

After the examination of Ludovick Armor, Mr. Wardle examined Mr. Adam, which examination led to a very novel

scene, namely, the reading of an *anonymous letter* in the House.—Mr. Wardle asked Mr. Adam whether he had a son, and was answered in the affirmative, adding, that he was Lieut.-Colonel of the 21st regt. of foot. Being asked at what age he was made a Lieut.-Colonel,

Mr. Adam said, that he would answer that question; but the House, he hoped, would allow him to make some previous observations. General sir Charles Stuart, the friend of his early life, asked him, whether any of his five sons had an inclination for the army. There was one of them 14 or 15 years of age, who he thought had a strong tendency that way. The general said, that by the rules of the service he was permitted to appoint him to an ensigncy. He was accordingly made ensign. His regiment was in Canada, and as he was so young he did not join immediately, *but was first sent to Woolwich for education.* As this question had been asked him, he hoped it would not be considered as unbecoming in him to say of so near a relation, that he distinguished himself extremely. A second commission was given him by gen. Stuart, in a manner equally gratuitous. When the great Abercrombie, likewise the friend of my early life, was sent to the Helder, he went under him at the age of sixteen, as a volunteer. The House would pardon him, as it was impossible for him not to feel strongly, he must state his merits. He landed in a hot fire, and conducted himself so as to command the applause and thanks of all who surrounded him. He was present in every active engagement during that expedition. He commanded a body of men of the number generally committed to a lieutenant. They were from the Supplemental Militia, and required a great deal of management, and it was universally allowed that he conducted them well. When he returned, he was, without any solicitation of his (Mr. Adam), so help him God, appointed to the Coldstream Guards. There he remained till he went to Egypt again under Abercrombie, accompanied by his friend, who had made the same progress as himself, (the son of sir John Warren) who was killed by his side. He landed at the head of the guards, at the famous landing in Egypt, and distinguished himself equally well on that occasion. On his return the duke again appointed him to the rank of major, and at the age of twenty-one he rose to the situation of lieutenant-colonel of the second battalion of the 21st, and afterwards of the first battalion, he (Mr. Adam) having merely stated a circumstance in his favour, which he left entirely to the Duke's consideration; and this regiment was as well commanded as any in the service: he might call upon the officers who were acquainted with the service to confirm his words; and sir John Moore, if he had been alive, would have spoken of him.—Mr. Adam said, that he now would read a letter which he had received, and which appeared to have some reference to this question.

He then read a Letter, which he had received, and of which the following is the report, as given in the Courier news-paper of the 4th of February:

"Sir, your character was once respected; that is now over. Your shifting in the House of Commons, and your interference in the duke of York's lechery concerns, would have dubbed any other man a pimp. This subseviency to royalty has made your son a Colonel at twenty years, and given your other boy a ship."—(I wish, exclaimed the hon. gentleman, turning to Mr. Wardle, you would ask me a question respecting this son too, that I might have an opportunity of telling by what means he got his ship).—"Bravo! Go on! Try if you can say you act for no profit when you get your sons thus provided for. Decide as you please, that the man who is paid for his services out of the public purse, because he is the second man in the kingdom, as you say, and a prince, forsooth, should not shew a good example. Let the Commons decide as they will, the public will judge for themselves; and it is not a decision of the Bear Garden that will convince burdened millions that black is white. This rubric" (it was written in red ink) "is typical of my feelings. I blush for you, and wish you would change your principles to correspond with the colour of your hair, and live the latter part of your time in honour. Though the decision of the House will not go far with the public, yet all eyes are upon it, and the damnation or salvation of the Commons depends upon this decision."

There will be much for observation upon these matters hereafter; but, I cannot refrain from observing, that this audacious letter appeared to kindle somewhat of wrath in the breasts of the honourable House. Mr. ELLISON said it was unworthy of the character of an individual to pay attention to anonymous letters. Mr. ADAM said, that the letter was written to deter him from doing his duty, and to libel the House of Commons, both of which were beyond the power of any such attempts; that he had to protect his own and his family's honour, and that he would do it without minding the opinion of any one.—Mr. PULLER defended the reading of the letter, and said the House ought to be whipped, if they did not offer £.500 or £.1000 for discovering the author. "If you are such poor creatures," said he; but was stopped by a loud and general cry of, *order.*—The public are much obliged to Mr. Adam for reading this letter, and to Mr. Wardle for taking care to have it inserted in the Evidence. Yet, strange to say, the Morning Chronicle has suppressed it. That print states, that there was a very abusive and vulgar letter

read;
not dea
the hon

Now,
of the
or that
course,
ing wh
news-pa
may, for
as I sa
been so
them, a
to the
speedy p
to be de
ferred
House,
before a
as far as
work of
be my
of the b
the trut
the trut
by, ev
this be
this in
any ha
be any
prejudi
the tim
from h
doing
to the
proper
proof
sations
opinio
to hea
sation
or I a
their
chanc
it is b
frequ
cient
this s
reade
misse
shall
being
we sh
to m
ture
not
woul
dem
But,
justi
requ

read; but, it does not insert it. This is not dealing fairly either with Mr. Adam, the honourable House, or the Public.

Now, in the account which I have given of the Evidence, as well as of the debates, or that I shall give of either, I am, of course, to be understood merely as re-stating what has been before stated in the news-papers, which original statements may, for ought I know, be incorrect; but, as I said before, if I find them to have been so, I will lose no time in correcting them, and communicating the correction to the public.——Publicity, and even *speedy publicity*, is what Mr. Canning stated to be desirable, and for that reason he preferred an examination at the bar of the House, in preference to an examination before a committee, upon *oath*. To assist, as far as my little sheet is capable, in this work of publicity, is my object, and shall be my constant endeavour, until the whole of the business is closed. My wish is, that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, should be known to, and believed by, every soul in the kingdom; and, if this be the case, great good must arise from this inquiry, while it is impossible that any harm can arise from it.——If there be any one, who, from report, has imbibed prejudices against the Duke of York, this is the time for him to dismiss those prejudices from his mind. He should resolve upon doing that; and by no means give way to the very prevalent and dangerous propensity of hailing open accusation as proof of guilt, merely because such accusations correspond with his pre-conceived opinions. Nothing is more common than to hear men exclaim, when an open accusation takes place, “Ah! I always said so, or I always thought so.” In this state of their minds, the accused stands but a poor chance. They wish him to be guilty; and it is but too true, that, what we wish, we frequently believe, with or without sufficient reason. Against the whisperings of this spirit of injustice I wish to guard the reader. I hope that all prejudices will be dismissed from the mind of the public; that we shall all look upon the Duke of York as being now accused for the *first time*; that we shall consider him as a person exposed to much ill-will and obloquy from the nature of his situation; and that we shall not condemn him without such proof as would be sufficient to produce the condemnation of any one of ourselves.——But, on the other hand, justice to ourselves, justice to our country and to the army, requires that we should not be carried away

from rational and fair conclusions by any assertions, or insinuations, against the authors of the accusation or against any of the witnesses; by any out-cry about a *Jacobin Conspiracy*, and the *licentiousness of the press*, and a design against the House of Brunswick. These, I trust, we shall regard as empty sounds. The utmost extent, to which the press has gone, upon this subject, is, to have published, that *Major Hogan told the Duke of York, that promotions were to be purchased of women at reduced prices; that the Major offered to prove this to the Duke, and that the Duke made no answer, and never called for the proof.* This is the utmost extent of the “*licentiousness of the press.*” The statement may be false; Major Hogan did, perhaps, never say this to the Duke; but, observe, the major does not accuse the Duke of receiving, either directly or indirectly, any part of the money; nor does he accuse him of knowing that any other person got money in such a way. Well, then, how has the press sinned? What has it done, in this case, to be so severely censured? What has it done to excite “a doubt whether the benefits of its freedom be not overbalanced by its licentiousness?” It has now been proved before the parliament itself, that, at the recommendation of the physician of Mrs. Clarke, money was offered to her to obtain from the Duke of York the grant of an exchange in the army; it has been proved, that the exchange soon afterwards took place; and it has been proved, that the money was paid to her according to the terms of the bargain. Must not the parties to this transaction have believed that Mrs. Clarke was the cause of the exchange? Must not they have believed this? Were they not liable to talk of it? If such like transactions were frequent, must not the knowledge of them have spread? And, if any public writer came to the knowledge of them, was it not his bounden duty to state them to the public? If not for such purposes, I should be glad to know for what purpose there is, or ever was, any thing, called “the freedom of the press.”——Mr. Sheridan told the House, that he had besought Mr. Wardle not to proceed with this business, a fact of which I have not the smallest doubt; but he added, that his “honourable friend” (for so he called him) had lent himself to the designs of “a foul conspiracy.” Foul conspiracy as long as he pleases; but that will not remove the effect of the evidence of Dr. Thynne, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Adam; the word *conspiracy* will have no weight against the proofs

of the £. 200 bargain with, and of the annuity to, Mrs. Clarke; nor will it have any weight at all against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke herself. Conspiracy, indeed! Who should conspire? Where is the conspiracy? Much has been said about the cowardice of general insinuations against the Duke, and about the advantage of, at last, getting at the accusations in a *tangible* shape. Why do we hear nothing specific about this conspiracy? A conspiracy generally implies conspirators. Where are they? At present, all the persons that have appeared are Dr. Thynne, Mr. Robert Knight, and Mrs. Clarke. Are these some of the conspirators? Is Mr. Adam one, who has told us all about the connection and the annuity? Who the devil are these conspirators then? Where is the place of their meeting? Why not place this conspiracy before us in a "*tangible* shape?" These loose assertions about a conspiracy must operate to the injury of the Duke of York; for the people of this country are too much in the habit of deciding upon the merits of the case; of deciding upon actual evidence, not to suspect to be bad that cause, which has recourse to *recrimination*. It is so constantly the case to hear the guilty revile his accusers, that if the Duke had a *real* friend, that friend would not fail to avoid all such revilings, not fully justified by the *proved* turpitude or malice of the party reviled.—"Jacobinism"! Is it, then, to be a jacobin to complain, that bargains such as that between Mrs. Clarke and Mr. Knight were going on? Is it to be a jacobin to complain, that while the Duke of York was borrowing public money from the minister, he was, as his counsellor has informed us, settling an annuity of £. 400 a year upon a person such as her whom this counsellor has described to us, and who has now, in the parliament, been called "*an infamous woman*"? Is this Jacobinism? Is this to conspire against the illustrious House of Brunswick? Oh! no. It is not the House of Brunswick, but the House in Gloucester Place, and other such scenes of corruption and profligacy, if any exist, that the conspiracy is formed against; and, say the revilers of the press what they will, this is a conspiracy of which all the virtuous part of the nation approves, and in which it most cordially partakes. Is the man, who sees thus squandered part, at least, of the means which his incessant in-

dustry has collected, and which his paternal affection would fain devote to the comfort of his one-day fatherless family; is such a man, because he feels sore, because he expresses his indignation at seeing his earnings squandered in this way; is such a man for such a cause to be reviled as a jacobin and a conspirator, and to be held forth as worthy of the gibbet? If this be the case, away with all the talk about the sacrifices necessary for our defence against a conqueror; for if the devil himself were to become our master, he could not make our situation worse. But, I hope and trust, this is not to be the case; I trust we shall still have a country to fight for, and courage to defend it; that we shall still be *truly* free and *truly* loyal in spite of all the endeavours of all our enemies foreign and domestic; in spite of all their efforts to enslave us, or to goad us into disloyalty.—To Mr. WARDLE, for his public spirit, his frankness, his candid and bold manner of bringing the matter forward, his steady perseverance, and all the admirable qualities he has displayed, upon this occasion, the unanimous thanks of all the worthy part of the nation are due, and, I will add, are justly rendered. I have not conversed with a single person upon the subject, who has not expressed admiration at this gentleman's conduct. No, he did not *consult* with you, Mr. Sheridan, nor with any of the party; but, this, Sir, is that part of his conduct which we most approve of. He wanted no counsel but that of a sound head and an honest heart; no support from any thing but truth and justice. He wanted no "*parliamentary experience*." None of what has been called "the tactic of the House." He had a complaint to make, in the name of the people, and he made it, without discovering fear either for himself or for his cause. He has neither obtained, nor asked for, any indulgence. In his arduous and most laborious task, he has received assistance from SIR FRANCIS BURDETT and LORD FOLKESTONE; but, whether by *declaimers* or any thing else, he appears never to have been disconcerted; his own resources appear never to have failed him; and, at every stage of the proceeding, he has risen in the esteem of the nation, the trading "*anti-jacobins*" excepted.

Botley, Wednesday, 8th Feb. 1809.